

Realized budget process as involves the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee, FYR 2021/2022

Intention

In constructing the new Budget Allocation Model (BAM), the Budget Allocation Steering Committee (BASC) recommended that the completed preliminary university budget be presented to the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee (FSB&PC) at least 2 weeks before it is submitted to the Executive Budget Committee. The FSB&PC is to have this 2-week period to examine the budget, inform the Faculty Senate of the budget, and provide feedback on the budget to the Executive Budget Committee. This presentation is to occur in mid-March and serves two purposes. The first purpose is to provide information on the proposed budget to the faculty via the Faculty Senate. This presentation is intended to serve the important goal of transparency as laid out in the BASC's recommendations. The second goal is to allow the faculty, via the FSB&PC, the opportunity to provide feedback to the University on the proposed budget. This feedback opportunity is in service of the University's goal of shared governance.

The BASC also recommended the creation of a Support Unit Allocation Committee which will review support unit budget proposals and make recommendations to the Executive Budget Committee. A member of the FSB&PC is on this committee. The goal of creating this committee (as stated in its proposed charter), having faculty representation on it, and tasking it with evaluating support unit proposals is to review the budget for:

- Alignment with the Institution's mission
- Clearly stated strategic objectives
- Evidence of effective and efficient use of resources
- Adequate service level demand and agreements
- Efficient workforce plans

In addition, the Faculty Handbook states (emphasis added):

1.10 Faculty Role in Budget Making

Faculty judgments about the academic program have significant bearing on the shape of the budget, and budgetary decisions affect the shape of the academic programs. The faculty are asked to participate in establishing major institutional priorities in several ways. The Faculty Senate, through its Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, gives approval for establishing new programs and for terminating existing ones. Administrative judgments about the costs of these programs inform this deliberation and in turn are affected by the judgments of the faculty as to the pedagogical and intellectual soundness of such proposals. Deans, department heads, and the chief academic officer consult with appropriate faculty groups at their respective levels concerning the general fiscal implications of decisions about the curriculum, enrollment, class-size, and admission policies. **The Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee participates in the presentation of budgetary needs presented to the chief academic officer on an annual basis. The chair of the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee serves on the Executive Budget Committee.**

Actuality

The FSB&PC has not received the budget information. It appears that the budget information will not be available to the committee prior to its presentation to the Executive Budget Committee and so the

FSB&PC will not be able to provide feedback or inform the faculty of the proposed budget prior to its adoption.

The Executive Budget Committee, as currently constructed, does not have the chair of the FSB&PC as a member.

The Support Unit Allocation Committee has met, once. They were presented with unrealistic budgets and the support units had to go back and rework their budgets. They haven't met since and have not been able to perform their review.

In contrast with the above noted lack of shared governance regarding the overall budget process, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee and the FS President and President-Elect were invited to budget presentations of the various Colleges held by the Provost's Office. The Senate leadership was provided the opportunity to ask questions and comment during these presentations. This process only involved the presentations by the Colleges, not any overall budget discussions on other components of the Provost Office (e.g. Graduate School, Student Success, etc.) about which the Faculty Senate has not been informed or consulted.

Conclusion

The budget process for the current year hasn't been as transparent as designed. It hasn't followed the transparency procedures laid out in the creation of the BAM process. It has also not been consistent with the University's shared governance principles. There has been no opportunity for faculty information or feedback.